

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332)  
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973)  
Chief, Criminal Division

EUMI L. CHOI (WVBN 722)  
Assistant United States Attorney

150 Almaden Boulevard  
San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone: (408) 535-5079  
Facsimile: (408) 535-5066  
Email: Eumi.Choi@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for the United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVID HINKEL, and  
JEFFREY RYAN SMITH,

Defendants.

No. CR 07-00675 JF

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~  
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM  
JANUARY 30, 2008 TO MARCH 5, 2008,  
and FEBRUARY 1, 2008 TO MARCH 5,  
2008 FROM THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT  
CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. §  
3161(h)(8)(A),(B))

On January 30, 2008, defendant Smith appeared for a hearing before the Honorable Patricia V. Trumbull on a writ of habeas corpus issued on January 29, 2008. At that time, the Court set the matter for a status hearing on March 5, 2008. The parties stipulated to an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act to allow counsel for defendant reasonable time for effective preparation.

On February 1, 2008, defendant Hinkel appeared for a detention hearing before the Honorable Patricia V. Trumbull. At that time, based upon the request of the parties, the Court set the matter for a status hearing, also on March 5, 2008. The parties stipulated to an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act to allow counsel for defendant reasonable time for effective

RECEIVED

2008 FEB 28 AM 11:16

E-FILED  
RICHARD H. WIEKING  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NO. DIST. OF CAL. S.J.

FILED

FEB 29 2008

CLERK  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE

1 preparation.

2 The United States hereby submits this written request for an order finding that said time  
3 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, in that the ends of justice are served  
4 by taking such action and outweigh the best interests of the public and defendants in a speedy  
5 trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A). Further, the failure to grant such a continuance would  
6 unreasonably deny counsel for defendants the reasonable time necessary for effective  
7 preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

8  
9 DATED: February 27, 2008

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO  
United States Attorney

10  
11 \_\_\_\_\_/s/  
12 EUMI L. CHOI  
Assistant United States Attorney

13  
14 \_\_\_\_\_/s/  
15 NICHOLAS HUMY  
Counsel for Defendant Hinkel

16  
17 \_\_\_\_\_/s/  
18 SCOTT FURSTMAN  
Counsel for Defendant Smith

**ORDER**

Based upon the stipulation of the parties, and for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between January 30, 2008 and March 5, 2008 as to defendant Smith is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, and, similarly, the time between February 1, 2008 and March 5, 2008 as to defendant Hinkel is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161. The Court finds that the ends of justice are served by taking such action and outweigh the best interests of the public and defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A). Further, the failure to grant such a continuance would unreasonably deny counsel for defendants the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B) (iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 2/29/08

  
PATRICIA V. TRUMBULL  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE